

Let me say a word regarding an issue that has come up recently. In addition to falling short in getting TPP on the right track, the TPA bill also presents dangers with other agreements. This TPA will be, essentially, in place for 6 years. It gives the President a great deal of latitude in deciding which agreements to negotiate with whatever trading partners the President wants and covering whatever subject the President wants.

Recently, Senator ELIZABETH WARREN drew heavy criticism for expressing the concern that TPA could be used by a Republican President to undermine Dodd-Frank. The concern was dismissed as speculative and desperate, but as explained below, the concern is genuine and legitimate.

In ongoing trade agreement negotiations to establish a TTIP, European officials, U.S. and European banks, and some congressional Republicans have expressed an interest in harmonizing U.S. and EU financial services in a way that would water down U.S. laws and regulations. Similarly, some Republican Presidential candidates have expressed an interest in weakening or in repealing Dodd-Frank, although not simply through the TTIP negotiations. Of course, doing so through TTIP negotiations would give the President the excuse that agreeing to weaken Dodd-Frank was simply part of a quid pro quo to get something we wanted from Europe.

According to an article from Politico: "White House and pro-trade officials on the Hill say that the fast-track bill currently before Congress includes language that expressly forbids changing U.S. law without congressional action." But this language is nothing new. Legislation to implement trade agreements typically includes similar language. The purpose of the language is simply to make clear that, under U.S. law, our trade agreements do not have "direct effect" and are not "self-executing," meaning that domestic laws and regulations need to be amended to give effect to any obligation in an international agreement.

Implementing bills typically make changes to U.S. tariff laws to comply with the tariff obligations of trade agreements, but some implementing bills make more substantial, behind-the-border changes to U.S. laws to comply with the obligations in our trade agreements. That has been true of changes to U.S. patent laws and changes to the Immigration and Nationality Act.

With all of these concerns in mind—and, above all, my determination to do everything I can to get TPP in shape to garner broad, bipartisan support in Congress—the Ways and Means Democrats offered a substitute amendment during the markup of the TPA bill. That amendment, the Right Track for TPP Act, includes negotiating instructions, not merely "negotiating objectives" like the TPA bill, on each of the 12 major outstanding issues, some of

which I have described earlier. It provides that the President will not get an up-or-down vote unless and until Congress determines that the instructions have been followed. It also includes real mechanisms to ensure that a poorly negotiated TPP agreement will not be placed on a fast track.

Regrettably, our substitute amendment was blocked in committee based on a highly questionable procedural determination from the chair. In essence, while the Republican majority was free to mark up a bill that was in both the jurisdiction of our committee and the Rules Committee, we were denied the right to do the very same thing. Our chair was concerned about stepping on the jurisdiction of the Rules Committee, and yet the Rules Committee has waived jurisdiction over the TPA bill.

As is often the case with trade debates, they become about something they are not. This debate is not about being for TPP or against. I am for the right TPP, and that is why I want Congress to be in a position to press negotiators to secure a better outcome.

This debate is not about letting China write the rules. I wrote the amendments to the bill granting China PNTR to try and ensure China did not write the rules when they entered the WTO.

□ 1445

This debate is not about isolationism. Neither I nor any colleague of mine is arguing that we should pull up the drawbridge and isolate ourselves. Indeed, most of us who currently oppose TPA right now have demonstrated on a broad range of issues that we are internationalists, perhaps more so than those who support TPA.

This debate is not about national security or the pivot to Asia. I understand the national security issues. Indeed, what happened was years ago Wilbur Mills said let's take trade negotiations out of the State Department and put them in USTR in order to be sure that the economic advantages were not traded away for political advantages.

In the world today, I don't see how a trade agreement can be in our national security interest if it isn't in our economic interest. Fifty years ago, when the U.S. was an economic superpower, unlike any other nation in the world, maybe we could grant our trading partners disproportionate and nonreciprocal conditions in exchange for political advantages. That is what Wilbur Mills said. That is not the case today. Our economic security is critical to our national security.

Proponents of TPA are trying to sell TPA by selling TPP itself. Unfortunately, that is the problem. TPP is not yet on the right track. It has not earned "the most progressive trade agreement in history" moniker that the President has given it. The best course for Congress is to withhold fast track until we know TPP is on a better

course, to press the administration to work with us and really respond to our concerns by changing the course of negotiations, to send a signal to our negotiating partners that the Congress has set a high bar for negotiations, that we are demanding the best deal; and, in a number of areas, I think these countries will welcome the improvements I have suggested.

At the end of the day, the goal is to achieve a Trans-Pacific Partnership worthy of support, a TPP that spreads the benefits of trade to the broadest swath of the American public and addresses trade's negative impacts. That is really what this negotiation is all about. This is what really, really very much motivates my concern to get TPP right, not to give away our leverage until TPP is correct.

Voting now for TPA, when there is so much yet to be done to make TPP right, essentially gives away our leverage, essentially is a kind of a blank check to the administration. I feel so deeply about the importance of trade, the importance of getting it right, that I really urge that should be our focus.

So I urge my colleagues not to give away our leverage, not to vote for TPA until TPP is done correctly. That is the challenge before us. That is the challenge likely to be before the House of Representatives the week after next. That is a challenge that we must surmount. That is a challenge that we must meet. That is a reflection of the years of many of us in trying to make trade be put on the right track.

That motivated us years ago when we put together the May 10 agreement; that motivated us when we negotiated the agreement with Peru, we who negotiated it. That is our dedication. We support trade when expanded trade is shaped so that all benefit. That is not true today of this TPP, and therefore I hope my colleagues will join together in voting "no" on TPA until TPP is gotten right. That is our goal; that is our purpose—that is our only purpose—and I think that is our challenge, and I hope the week after next we are going to meet it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

RELIGIOUS FREEDOM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RUSSELL). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOONEY) for 30 minutes.

Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, America is a beacon of hope and opportunity to the world for a reason. Our military veterans, whom we honor this Monday during Memorial Day, put their lives on the line for our freedoms and constitutional rights. Our Founders put in place a Constitution that is inspired by the fundamental Judeo-Christian belief that men and women are created in God's image, with the right to life, property, freedom to worship, and carry out their

religious convictions without government interference or persecution.

We may take this idea for granted today, with 250 years of history at our backs, but at the time of our Nation's founding, the idea of religious freedom was radical. The world was a different place then. God-fearing, peaceful citizens around the world were commonly persecuted for their beliefs. They were tortured and thrown in prison without a fair hearing. In short, they did not have freedom. These are rights and freedoms that many in our country take for granted. They were denied what our Founders held to be basic human rights.

So at a great risk to themselves and their families, but with deeply held optimism for a new and better future, they sailed the Atlantic Ocean for the shores of the New World, for America.

Here they planted a new society based on freedom. Centuries later, we in this legislative body, are the guardians of this legacy. We are here to advance freedom and protect liberty. But we must be vigilant in this task.

President Ronald Reagan once said:

Freedom is never more than one generation away from extinction. We didn't pass it to our children in the bloodstream. It must be fought for, protected, and handed on for them to do the same, or one day we will spend our sunset years telling our children and our children's children what it was once like in the United States where men were free.

I agree with President Reagan, and that is why I rise today. Our basic freedoms are under attack. We must stand up and fight. We don't need to search long to find the wreckage of a society that does not value freedom.

I recently met with a group of constituents, Syrian Americans who live in Charleston, West Virginia. Many of them have family members and loved ones in Syria. Their stories provide a strong warning to us. In Syria, a cruel and brutal dictator, al-Assad, is attempting to silence opposing views. He has resorted to chemical weapon attacks on his own people. He has gunned down his own citizens. He has bombed hospitals and apartment complexes full of women and children. We can learn an important lesson from Syria: once tyranny grabs hold, it will grow and expand its reach. And the consequences can be drastic. In Syria, 4 out of 5 people live in poverty, more than 200,000 have been killed, a million wounded, and more than 3 million have fled the country.

But we should not be so arrogant as to think that our liberties here at home in the United States are safe. The evidence that our basic freedoms are under siege is growing, and I would like to share just a few stories that have recently come to my attention. For example, an 8-year-old second grade student in a New Jersey public school wanted to sing "Awesome God" at her after-school talent show, but she was told she couldn't because of the song's religious lyrics.

The Arizona Republic reported in July of 2012 that the pastor of a church

in Phoenix, Arizona, was jailed and fined \$12,000 for hosting a Bible study meeting in his private home. They outrageously claimed it violated zoning and fire code ordinances.

Five men in Richmond, Virginia, were threatened with arrest by local police officers for sharing their faith on a public sidewalk.

The University of Missouri threatened to withhold a student's diploma because she refused to participate in a class assignment that required her to write a letter to the Missouri legislator in support of homosexual adoption.

In a New York hospital, a pro-life nurse was coerced into providing a late-term abortion, even though her workplace had agreed in writing to honor her religious beliefs.

And in the beautiful Second Congressional District of West Virginia, which I have the honor of representing, Joe Holland, a businessowner, is currently being pushed to violate his religious views and values by an ObamaCare regulation that requires him to provide abortifacient drugs to his employees as a part of so-called health care. A regulation commonly known as the HHS mandate requires him to provide the drugs or face a penalty of \$100 per day per employee. For a company of 150 employees, that is about \$5.5 million a year, or about \$36,000 per employee.

These are just a few of the alarming stories about the religious freedoms of peaceful, God-fearing Americans being snatched away by a government that has lost its way. It is no coincidence that the very First Amendment to the United States Constitution says: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press, or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the government for a redress of grievances."

Religious freedom was protected in the First Amendment to the Constitution. Our Forefathers valued that. They knew what could happen if we didn't protect our religious freedom.

We must take action and recommit ourselves to this basic right. Congress actually has taken action in the past on a bipartisan basis. In 1993, Congress passed the Religious Freedom Restoration Act, signed by President Clinton. The law says the government should not force anyone to violate their sincere religious beliefs, whether those beliefs are considered widely shared or not. This legislation unanimously passed this Chamber, United States House of Representatives, and it passed the Senate by a vote of 97-3 on October 27, 1993.

The broad support is because the legislation simply affirms our constitutionally endowed rights. But now support for this formerly bipartisan, widely supported law is eroding to the point that it has come under attack around the country, the recent events in Indiana being the recent highest profile example.

I believe that this Congress must be a Congress of action in defending religious freedoms. I understand that my good friend and colleague from Idaho, Mr. LABRADOR, is working on a bill to protect institutions and individuals who believe that marriage is between one man and one woman. I support this effort, and I look forward to being an original cosponsor when he introduces the bill.

I am also a proud cosponsor of the Child Welfare Provider Inclusion Act, which will ensure that adoption and foster care providers are not excluded by States for offering their services based on their religious beliefs. Unfortunately, some States have already begun punishing faith-based organizations that provide these services because of their religious beliefs. These religious freedom protections are needed now, and I hope they will be allowed a vote in this Chamber.

We can't do this alone. We do need the President, President Obama, to join with us to protect religious freedom. The President said on June 26, 2013, regarding the U.S. Supreme Court decision to strike down the Defense of Marriage Act the following about religious freedom: "On an issue as sensitive as this, knowing that Americans hold a wide range of views based on deeply held beliefs, maintaining our Nation's commitment to religious freedom is also vital."

□ 1500

If the President really believes that religious freedom is "vital," he must back his words up with action. That hasn't happened. In fact, just the opposite has occurred, with the administration's attack on the Religious Freedom Restoration Act, which attacks those who believe in religious freedom, through its HHS mandate and its attack on the Defense of Marriage Act. He is not protecting religious freedom. We have to do that here.

We have a sacred obligation to pass on to our children and grandchildren a country that has the same love for liberty and religious freedom as the one we inherited, but this won't happen on its own. We need to stand up and fight with courage and conviction, fight right here and right now.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

--- **HOOR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW**

Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 2:30 p.m. tomorrow.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

--- **PAYING TRIBUTE TO THE MEMORY OF ALBERT MELVIN MILLER**

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the Chair recognizes the